



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,712	04/09/2004	Tsuyoshi Sato	251701US0	9490
22850	7590	04/18/2006	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ROBINSON, HOPE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/820,712	Applicant(s) SATO ET AL.	
	Examiner Hope A. Robinson	Art Unit 1656	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/17/04; 9/8/04</u> . | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Notice to Comply</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

Application Status

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1 and 2) on January 9, 2006 and applicant's election with traverse of SEQ ID NO:1 except that position 63 and 187 is substituted with serine on February 9, 2006 is acknowledged.
2. The traversal is on the grounds that Group I and III embrace the same subject matter, namely, mutant alkaline proteases and product composition claims comprising the same products should be examined together. It is further stated that Groups I-III could be examined together without imposing an undue burden on the examiner as the genetic code provides an easy way to make corresponding searches of polypeptide and nucleic acid sequences of Groups I and II, respectively. This argument is not persuasive. Applicant agrees that the DNA and protein are different structurally. The DNA and protein have different functions and modes of operation. Although related, there is burden of search as evidenced by the different status that they have obtained in the art by the classification, and the search is not necessarily coextensive as a reference that anticipates or renders obvious one product may not anticipate or render obvious the other. However, if applicant is willing to make a statement on the record that the search is coextensive and a search of one product resulting in a reference that anticipates the claimed protein will also anticipate the claimed DNA then the two will be rejoined. The MPEP states that restriction requirement is proper if the inventions can

Art Unit: 1656

be shown to be independent and or distinct (see chapter 803). Thus, the Restriction requirement is deemed to be proper and is final.

Claim Disposition

3. Claims 1-7 are pending. Claims 1-2 are under examination. Claims 3-7 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.12(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

4. The Amendments filed on October 1, 2004 and August 17, 2005 have been received and entered.

Specification

5. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities:

(a) The specification is objected to because the following typographical error appears on page 15, "resistered" (line 20) which should be "registered".

(b) The specification is also objected to because the "Brief Description of the Drawing" section of the specification only describes Fig. 1, however, the drawings represent Fig. 1-1 through Fig.1-5; and no description of these is provided.

(c) It is noted that applicant claimed priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a-d), however, the first page of the specification does not reflect this, it is suggested that the specification is amended to recite "This application claims benefit to Japan 2003-106708, filed April 10, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a-d)."

Art Unit: 1656

(d) The specification is objected to because trademarks are disclosed throughout the instant specification and not all of them are capitalized or accompanied by the generic terminology. The use of the trademarks such as TAQ PCR™, for example, have been noted in this application (see page 22). It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks. It is suggested that applicant check the entire specification for others and properly notate the trademarks.

Correction is required.

Abstract

6. The Abstract is objected to because of the following informalities:

Two paragraphs appear in the present abstract. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Art Unit: 1656

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc..

Sequence Compliance

7. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825; applicant's attention is directed to the final rule making notice published at 55 FR 18230 (May 1, 1990), and 1114 OG 29 (May 15, 1990). To be in compliance, applicant is required to identify all amino acid sequences of at least 4 L-amino acids and at least 10 nucleotides by a sequence identifier, i.e., "SEQ ID NO:". The specification discloses sequences that have not been identified by a sequence identifier, see for example, page 28, line 13. If these sequences have not been disclosed in the computer readable form of the sequence listing and the paper copy thereof, applicant must provide a computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" including these sequences, a paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification, and a statement that the content of the paper and computer readable form copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter as required by 37 CFR 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.821(b) or 1.825(d). See the attached Notice to Comply with the sequence rules.

Drawing

8. The Drawings filed on August 17, 2004 have been accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Objection

9. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

For clarity and precision of claim language it is suggested that claim 1 is amended to read "An isolated alkaline protease having an amino acid sequence wherein one or more amino acid residues located at (a) position 63, (b) position 89 (c) position 120, (d) position 63 and 187, (e) position 226, (f) position 296, (g) position 304 of the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1, are the following amino acid residues, respectively" (a) serine, (b) histidine, (c) arginine, (d) serine, (e) tyrosine, (f) valine, and (g) serine. See also claim 2.

Correction is required.

Information Disclosure Statement

10. The Information Disclosure Statements filed on August 17, 2004 and September 8, 2004 have been received and entered. The references cited on the PTO-1449 Form have been considered by the examiner and a copy is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 and 2 are drawn to an alkaline protease, which reads on a product of nature. The claims do not clearly set forth that the sequence has been modified/mutated via point mutations to demonstrate the hand of man. As natural mutations can occur, the claims require clarification. The claims should be amended to indicate the hand of the inventor, for example the insertion of isolated or purified in connection with the protease to identify a product not found in nature (see MPEP 2105).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to an alkaline protease having an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 or an amino acid sequence having 80% or higher homology with the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1. The claim encompasses a genus of proteins not adequately described. Therefore, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the proteins encompass absent adequate written description. The specification discloses only a single representative species of the claimed genus of SEQ ID NO: 1. The specification fails to provide any additional representative species of the claimed genus to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species, which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient

Art Unit: 1656

description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, disclosure of drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, for example, structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus.

Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus. The claimed genus of proteins could include non-functional proteins or proteins with a different function than the one described. Therefore, the genus of claimed polypeptides encompasses widely variant species. As such, neither the description of the structure and function of SEQ ID NO: 1, for example, "80% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:1" is sufficient to be representative of the attributes and features of the entire genus. Based on the unlimited variations contemplated one skilled in the art would at best expect a protein that is different or at worst a protein that is not functional. *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir.1991), states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in *possession of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure

Art Unit: 1656

of the encompassed genus of polypeptides, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993).

Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

13. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the protein set forth in SEQ ID NO: 1 and the 98% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:1 disclosed in the art, does not reasonably provide enablement for any protein having 80% or 90% etc. to SEQ ID NO:1. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The enablement requirement refers to the requirement that the specification describe how to make and how to use the invention. There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include, but are not limited to: Quantity of

Art Unit: 1656

Experimentation Necessary; Amount of direction or guidance presented; Presence or absence of working examples; Nature of the Invention; State of the prior art and Relative skill of those in the art; Predictability or unpredictability of the art and Breadth of the claims (see *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). The factors most relevant to the instant invention are discussed below.

The amount of experimentation required to practice the claimed invention is undue as the claims encompass an unspecified amount of variants/fragments of the sequences set forth in SEQ ID NO: 1. No correlation is made between the structure of the fragments/variants encompassed in the claims and a function. In addition, claim 2 recites percent sequence identity, for example 80% sequence homology does not indicate where variations will occur or what variations can be tolerated in the sequence. The instant specification does not demonstrate or provide guidance as to what the structure of the protein will be once modified or if said protein will be functional or exhibit the same properties or characteristics as the native protein. In the instant application, the partial structure in the form of the recited percent identity is insufficient to determine a chemical structure for the variants encompassed in the claims. Additionally, there is no data provided demonstrative of a particular portion of the structure that must be conserved. Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to generate the infinite number of variants/fragments recited in the claims and possibly screen same for activity and the lack of guidance/direction provided in the instant specification, this is merely an invitation to the skilled artisan to use the current invention as a starting point for further experimentation. Thus, undue experimentation would be required for a skilled

Art Unit: 1656

artisan to make and/or use the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Predictability of which potential changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (for example, expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the protein's structure relates to its function. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, for example, multiple substitutions. In this case, the necessary guidance has not been provided in the specification. Therefore, while it is known in the art that many amino acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the positions within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of success are limited, as certain positions in the sequence are critical to the protein's structure/function relationship. It is also known in the art that a single nucleotide or amino acid change or mutation can destroy the function of the biomolecule in many cases. For example, various sites or regions directly involved in binding activity and in providing the correct three-dimensional spatial orientation of binding and active sites can be affected (see Wells, *Biochemistry*, vol. 29, pages 8509-8517, 1990). The instant specification provides no guidance/direction as to which regions of the protein would be tolerant of modifications and which would not, and it provides no working examples of any variant sequence that is encompassed by the claims. It is in no way

Art Unit: 1656

predictable that randomly selected mutations, such as deletions, substitutions, additions, etc., in the disclosed sequences would result in a protein having activity comparable to the one disclosed. As plural substitutions for example are introduced, their interactions with each other and their effects on the structure and function of the protein is unpredictable. The skilled artisan would recognize the high degree of unpredictability that all the fragments/variants encompassed in the claims would retain the recited function.

The state of the prior art provides evidence for the high degree of unpredictability as stated above. Seffernick et al. (J. Bacteriology, vol. 183, pages 2405-2410, 2001) disclose two polypeptides having 98% sequence identity and 99% sequence identity, differing at only 9 out of 475 amino acids (page 2407, right column, middle and page 2408, Fig. 3). The polypeptides of Seffernick et al. are identical along relatively long stretches of their respective sequences (page 2408, Fig. 3), however, these polypeptides exhibit distinct functions. The modifications exemplified in the Seffernick et al. reference is small compared to those contemplated and encompassed by the claimed invention (see page 21 of the specification and claim 3, for example).

The specification lacks adequate guidance/direction to enable a skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims. Furthermore, while recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known in the art, it is not routine in the art to screen large numbers of mutated proteins where the expectation of obtaining similar activity is unpredictable based on the instant disclosure. The amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, and

predictability of what mutations can be tolerated in a protein's sequence and result in certain activity, which is very complex, and well outside the realm of routine experimentation, because accurate predictions of a protein's function from mere sequence data are limited, therefore, the general knowledge and skill in the art is not sufficient, thus the specification needs to provide an enabling disclosure.

The working examples provided do not rectify the missing information in the instant specification pertaining to the claimed variant. The nature and properties of this claim is difficult to ascertain from the examples provided as one of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to construct the variants of the claimed invention and examine the same for function.

The specification does not provide support for the broad scope of the claims, which encompass an unspecified amount of variants/fragments. The issue in this case is the breath of the claims in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the skill level artisan and the guidance presented in the instant specification and the prior art of record. This make and test position is inconsistent with the decisions of *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) where it is stated that "...scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art...". Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily and improperly extensive and undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, for all these reasons, the

Art Unit: 1656

specification is not considered to be enabling for one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention as the amount of experimentation required is undue, due to the broad scope of the claims, the lack of guidance and working examples provided in the specification and the high degree of unpredictability as evidenced by the state of the prior art, attempting to construct and test variants of the claimed invention would constitute undue experimentation. Making and testing the infinite number of possible variants to find one that functions as described is undue experimentation. Therefore, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner that reasonably correlates with the scope of the claims, to be considered enabling.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter, which applicant (s) regard as their invention.

Claim 2 is indefinite for the recitation of "80% homology", homology refers to ancestral or evolutionary linkage, not percent sequence identity that is calculated by a mathematical algorithm.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hatada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,803,222, November 5, 2001), based on species (e) and (f).

Hatada et al. teach a protein sequence that is 97.5% identical to the claimed SEQ ID NO:1 (alkaline protease). Hatada et al. teach two of the point mutations recited in the claims, at position 226Tyr and at position 296Val. Therefore, the limitations of the claims are met by the reference.

Conclusion

16. No claims are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 1656

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr, can be reached at (571) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope Robinson, MS

Patent Examiner

HOPE ROBINSON
PATENT EXAMINER

PRIOR APPLICATION NUMBER: JP 9-274570
PRIOR FILING DATE: 1997-06-08
NUMBER OF SEQ ID NOS: 24
SOFTWARE: Patent version 3.0
SEQ ID NO 8
LENGTH: 640
TYPE: PRT
ORGANISM: Bacillus sp.
US-09-920-954-8

Query Match 99.8%; Score 2242; DB 2; Length 640;
Best Local Similarity 99.8%; Pred. No. 3e-175;
Matches 433; Conservative 0; Mismatches 1; Indels 0; Gaps 0;

QY 1 NDVARGIVKADVAOSSYGLYGQGOIIVAVADTGLDTRNDSSMHEARFKITLALYALGRTN 60
DB 207 NDVARGIVKADVAOSSYGLYGQGOIIVAVADTGLDTRNDSSMHEARFKITLALYALGRTN 266
QY 61 NANDTNGHGTTHVAGSVLNGSTNKGMAPOANLVFOSIMDSGGIGLPSNLQTLFQOAYS 120
DB 267 NANDTNGHGTTHVAGSVLNGSTNKGMAPOANLVFOSIMDSGGIGLPSNLQTLFQOAYS 326
QY 121 AGARHTNSWGAANVGAAYTTDSRVVDYVRKNDMTILFAAGNEGNGGTTISAPGTAKNAI 180
DB 327 AGARHTNSWGAANVGAAYTTDSRVVDYVRKNDMTILFAAGNEGNGGTTISAPGTAKNAI 386
QY 181 TVGATENLRPSFGSYADNINHVAQFSSRGPTKGRIPDVMAFGTILSARSLAPDSSF 240
DB 387 TVGATENLRPSFGSYADNINHVAQFSSRGPTKGRIPDVMAFGTILSARSLAPDSSF 446
QY 241 WANDSKAYAMGTSNATPIVAGNVAOLREHFVNKRGITPKPSLLKALLAGAADIGLGY 300
DB 447 WANDSKAYAMGTSNATPIVAGNVAOLREHFVNKRGITPKPSLLKALLAGAADIGLGY 506
QY 301 PNGOQMGRTYLDKSLNVAAYNESSLSSTOKATYSFTATAGKPLKISLWSDAPASTTA 360
DB 507 PNGOQMGRTYLDKSLNVAAYNESSLSSTOKATYSFTATAGKPLKISLWSDAPASTTA 566
QY 361 SVTLVNDLVLVITAPNGTQYVGNDFTSFYNDMDGRNNVENVFINAPQSGTYTIEVOAYN 420
DB 567 SVTLVNDLVLVITAPNGTQYVGNDFTSFYNDMDGRNNVENVFINAPQSGTYTIEVOAYN 626
QY 421 VPVGQPTFSLAIYN 434
DB 627 VPVGQPTFSLAIYN 640

RESULT 6

US-09-985-689A-2
Sequence 2, Application US/09985689A
Patent No. 6803222
GENERAL INFORMATION:
APPLICANT: HATADA, YUJI
APPLICANT: OGAWA, AKINORI
APPLICANT: KAGEYAMA, YASUSHI
APPLICANT: SATO, TSUYOSHI
APPLICANT: ARAKI, HIROYUKI
APPLICANT: SUMITOMO, NOBUYUKI
APPLICANT: OKUDA, MITSUYOSHI
APPLICANT: SAKKI, KATSUHISA
TITLE OF INVENTION: Alkaline proteases
FILE REFERENCE: 215483USO
CURRENT APPLICATION NUMBER: US/09/985, 689A
PRIOR FILING DATE: 2002-07-01
PRIOR APPLICATION NUMBER: JP P2000-355166
PRIOR FILING DATE: 2000-11-22
PRIOR APPLICATION NUMBER: JP P2001-114048
PRIOR FILING DATE: 2001-04-12
NUMBER OF SEQ ID NOS: 7
SOFTWARE: Patent version 3.1
SEQ ID NO 2
LENGTH: 434
TYPE: PRT

ORGANISM: Bacillus sp.
US-09-985-689A-2

Query Match 97.5%; Score 2191; DB 2; Length 434;
Best Local Similarity 96.5%; Pred. No. 2.7e-171;
Matches 419; Conservative 13; Mismatches 2; Indels 0; Gaps 0;

QY 1 NDVARGIVKADVAOSSYGLYGQGOIIVAVADTGLDTRNDSSMHEARFKITLALYALGRTN 60
DB 1 NDVARGIVKADVAOSSYGLYGQGOIIVAVADTGLDTRNDSSMHEARFKITLALYALGRTN 60
QY 61 NANDTNGHGTTHVAGSVLNGSTNKGMAPOANLVFOSIMDSGGIGLPSNLQTLFQOAYS 120
DB 61 NANDTNGHGTTHVAGSVLNGSTNKGMAPOANLVFOSIMDSGGIGLPSNLQTLFQOAYS 120
QY 121 AGARHTNSWGAANVGAAYTTDSRVVDYVRKNDMTILFAAGNEGNGGTTISAPGTAKNAI 180
DB 121 AGARHTNSWGAANVGAAYTTDSRVVDYVRKNDMTILFAAGNEGNGGTTISAPGTAKNAI 180
QY 181 TVGATENLRPSFGSYADNINHVAQFSSRGPTKGRIPDVMAFGTILSARSLAPDSSF 240
DB 181 TVGATENLRPSFGSYADNINHVAQFSSRGPTKGRIPDVMAFGTILSARSLAPDSSF 240
QY 241 WANDSKAYAMGTSNATPIVAGNVAOLREHFVNKRGITPKPSLLKALLAGAADIGLGY 300
DB 241 WANDSKAYAMGTSNATPIVAGNVAOLREHFVNKRGITPKPSLLKALLAGAADIGLGY 300
QY 301 PNGOQMGRTYLDKSLNVAAYNESSLSSTOKATYSFTATAGKPLKISLWSDAPASTTA 360
DB 301 PNGOQMGRTYLDKSLNVAAYNESSLSSTOKATYSFTATAGKPLKISLWSDAPASTTA 360
QY 361 SVTLVNDLVLVITAPNGTQYVGNDFTSFYNDMDGRNNVENVFINAPQSGTYTIEVOAYN 420
DB 361 SVTLVNDLVLVITAPNGTQYVGNDFTSFYNDMDGRNNVENVFINAPQSGTYTIEVOAYN 420
QY 421 VPVGQPTFSLAIYN 434
DB 421 VPVGQPTFSLAIYN 434

RESULT 7

US-09-509-814A-4
Sequence 4, Application US/09509814A
Patent No. 6376227
GENERAL INFORMATION:
APPLICANT: TAKAIWA, MIKIO
APPLICANT: OKUDA, MITSUYOSHI
APPLICANT: SAKKI, KATSUHISA
APPLICANT: KUBOTA, HIROMI
APPLICANT: HITOMI, JUN
APPLICANT: KAGEYAMA, YASUSHI
APPLICANT: SHIKATA, SHITSUM
APPLICANT: NOMURA, MASAFUMI
TITLE OF INVENTION: ALKALINE PROTEASE
FILE REFERENCE: 0327-0832-0PCT
CURRENT APPLICATION NUMBER: US/09/509, 814A
PRIOR FILING DATE: 2000-04-06
PRIOR APPLICATION NUMBER: PCT/JP98/04528
PRIOR FILING DATE: 1998-10-07
PRIOR APPLICATION NUMBER: JP 9-274570
PRIOR FILING DATE: 1997-06-08
NUMBER OF SEQ ID NOS: 24
SOFTWARE: Patent version 3.0
SEQ ID NO 4
LENGTH: 639
TYPE: PRT
ORGANISM: Bacillus sp.
US-09-509-814A-4

Query Match 97.2%; Score 2183; DB 2; Length 639;
Best Local Similarity 96.3%; Pred. No. 2.1e-170;
Matches 418; Conservative 13; Mismatches 3; Indels 0; Gaps 0;

NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES

Applicant must file the items indicated below within the time period set the Office action to which the Notice is attached to avoid abandonment under 35 U.S.C. § 133 (extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a)).

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s):

- ☒ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to the final rulemaking notice published at 55 FR 18230 (May 1, 1990), and 1114 OG 29 (May 15, 1990). If the effective filing date is on or after July 1, 1998, see the final rulemaking notice published at 63 FR 29620 (June 1, 1998) and 1211 OG 82 (June 23, 1998).
- ☐ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(c).
- ☐ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☒ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked -up "Raw Sequence Listing."
- ☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A Substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.825(d).
- ☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 7. Other:

8. Applicant Must Provide:

- ☒ An initial or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing".
- ☒ An initial or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification.
- ☒ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g).

For questions regarding compliance to these requirements, please contact:

- For Rules Interpretation, call (703) 308-4216 or (703) 308-2923
- For CRF Submission Help, call (703) 308-4212
- For PatentIn software Program Support:
 - HELP DESK: (703) 739-8559, ext 508, M-F, 8 AM to 5 PM EST except holidays
 - Email: PATIN21HELP@uspto.gov
 - To purchase PatentIn software: (703) 306-2600

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR RESPONSE